

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is requested. Claims 1-11 are in the case.

I. ELECTION/RESTRICTION

The election of Group I, namely claims 1-11, is hereby affirmed, claims 12-26 have been canceled without prejudice to the possibility of pursuing that subject matter in a separate divisional application.

II. DRAWINGS

The drawings have been objected to as not showing a numeral "50". In response, attached is a copy of Figure 2 showing the numeral 50.

The drawings have been objected to because reference characters "23, 57, 58" have been used to designate both equipment features and plots shown in Figures 8 and 9. In response, the numeral shown in the Figures 8 and 9 have been designated at 23', 57' and 58'. Attached is a copy of Figures 8 and 9 showing the proposed amendments. Corrected formal drawings will be submitted once approval of the proposed corrections is received.

III. SPECIFICATION

The disclosure has been objected to in view of the reference at page 2 to U.S.-A-4,202,352 and "EP-A-6,650,051 (it is believed the Examiner intended to refer to EP-A-0650051 as referred to at page 2, line 4 of the specification). In response, the reference to those two patents has been deleted.

The specification has been objected to as not containing customary headings. In response, the specification has been amended to include those headings, including a brief description of the drawings. No new matter is entered.

IV. THE 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH, REJECTION

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite. In response, and without conceding to the merit of this rejection, claim 6 has been amended to replace "third humidity sensor" with "sample chamber humidity sensor". Withdrawal of this rejection is now respectfully requested.

V. THE ANTICIPATION REJECTIONS

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by WO 97/00444 to Mottram. Claims 1-6 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. 4,852,389 to Mayer. Those rejections are respectfully traversed.

Without conceding to the merit of the rejections, the method and apparatus claims in this case have been amended to include the feature of providing a source of humidified air and introducing into the sensor chamber humidified air from that source. Basis for the amendments appearing in claims 1 and 8 appears in the specification as originally filed, for example, at pages 7 and 15.

Neither of the cited references discloses a system which is designed to "pre-humidify" a sensor chamber and, as a separate step, introduce a sample into the sensor chamber which has been isolated from the humidified air source. It is this source of

introducing the sample which provides information from the olfactory sensors, which is distinct from a continuous flow method as described in the cited art. In Mottram, the stream of humid air is mixed with the test gas/vapour prior to entry into the sensor chamber. In Mayer, the humid air and test gas streams are separate and flow through the test chamber simultaneously, separated by a membrane.

In light of the amendments effected to claims 1 and 8, it is believed that the references cited by the Examiner do not anticipate the method and apparatus now claimed in this application. Moreover, there is no suggestion of the subject matter as now claimed in the cited Mottram and Mayer references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding anticipation rejections are accordingly respectfully requested.

Allowance of the application is awaited.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 

Leonard C. Mitchard
Reg. No. 29,009

LCM:lfm
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100

Attachments: Proposed Amended Figures 2, 8 and 9